

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 11-14 under 35 USC §101 in light of the further amendments to claim 11 wherein the concrete tangible result of providing a model is more clearly recited. As the Federal Circuit noted in *In Re Bilski*, 545 F.3d 943, 963 (Fed. Cir. 2008), electronic transformation of data into a visual depiction is sufficient to set forth a statutory claim. Claims 11-14 clearly set forth a visual depiction of mathematically derived data and are now believed to represent clear statutory subject matter.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 USC §112 is respectfully requested. Holography is now a rather mature art, and there are many known techniques for forming and displaying holographic images. For example, see USPTO class 359, subclasses 1 *et seq.* The particular techniques used for making a hologram or displaying a holographic image are not important to the claimed invention, and it is again submitted that one of ordinary skill would be enabled by the present specification to make the holographic representation itself in accordance with the predicate inventive steps recited in claim 11 by any of several known techniques.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of the claims over the prior art. It is submitted that there is no reason to combine the references to obtain the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection over the art of record should be withdrawn because it would not have been obvious that the root vector diagram used for the skeletal reconstruction of exemplified baryons can be interconnected to a concrete global gauge vector lattice, over which the stated utility of the invention is to explore the further elementary particle states and properties, e.g. the mesons. This is not at all obvious, *inter alia*, because the outcome of the root vector lattice cannot be predicted by its isolated composition, which likewise is not obvious. Thus, the office action appears to take the position that it is obvious to make any model from known data, but this is not supported by the art of record, and there is nothing in the art of record to establish the obviousness of applying the recited

method steps in the construction of a model, which has significant utility in the study of elementary particles.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication thereof is respectfully requested. The examiner is invited to contact the undersigned if any matter remains outstanding.

All necessary extensions of time are hereby requested. Please charge any fee deficiency and credit any excess to deposit account 50-1088.

Respectfully submitted,  
CLARK & BRODY



Conrad J. Clark  
Reg. No. 30,340

Suite 250  
1090 Vermont Ave., NW  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
202-835-1111  
202-835-1755(fax)  
January 21, 2009